City of Tempe – Summary of Comments included in their memo of November 21, 2002 which was distributed along with the MAG RASP Policy Committee Agenda.

This table includes suggestions for tasks to be included under the evaluation of alternatives MAG RASP Working Paper # 5, and is based on comments of November 21, 2002 by the City of Tempe to proposed outline from Wilbur Smith Associates of November 8, 2002.

Wilbur Smith Associates - Outline for Proposed Working Paper # 5	**Suggestions**
Summary of Major Items:	
Improved Technology: ▪ "Improved approaches to afford additional operating capacity. Most expected improvements - Phoenix Sky Harbor, Williams Gateway, Scottsdale"	▪ *Should state a potential for improved capacity at large commercial service airports where aircraft operate under IFR.* ***This will be done.*** The use of technology to handle separation issues also benefits instrument departures, however the actual overall benefit is difficult to predict because of extensive use of visual separation in respective terminal areas.
Maximized Airport Development: - ▪ Memorial Airport non-precision approach	▪ *If the airport is going to be restored, a precision approach should also be considered.* ***This could be done, but this comment doesn't relate to the outline of Working Paper #5 for which we are accepting comments. This recommendation was part of Working Paper #4 which was approved by the MAG RASP Policy Committee on September 4, 2002. It has been the practice of the Policy Committee not to reopen for comment Working Papers that have been approved.*** The precision approach could help to resolve future operational issues between adjacent airports provide an instrument practice facility.
New Airport Development: ▪ "Expand Williams Gateway" Description of evaluation methodology:	▪ *Mesa's proposal for a 4th runway at Williams Gateway should be included.* ***This has been done.*** We find the wording somewhat unclear: Are proposed new airport developments subject to be evaluated as a group or as individual projects?
Summary of Evaluation Criteria:	

Environmental **<u>Noise</u>** Noise Impact Evaluation methodology: ▪ Status Quo Alternative: Compare operation levels on which current 4 noise contours are based with the MAG RASP 2025 to identify potential noise impact areas beyond existing contours ▪ Technology Alternative: No changes to noise impact anticipated ▪ Maximized Airport Development Alternative: Identify significant improvement projects not identified in previous planning and noise contours to determine potential noise impact ▪ New Airport Development: Potential noise impact areas will be identified.	Status Quo: ▪ *Changes in airport configuration or terminal routes since most recent noise contours should be addressed*. ***Changes can be acknowledged but ,a large scale system planning effort does not address the changes in detail. This is addressed in FAA environmental analysis.*** Maximized Airport Development: ▪ *Potential impact on existing constraints in Noise Compatibility Plans on free runway utilization should be identified.* ***Clarificationnn needs to be provided on this item from the City of Tempe.*** Maximized Airport Development & New Airport Development: ▪ *Include population density forecast for areas subject to airport capacity improvements.* ▪ *Identify non-sensitive land uses currently available to absorb projected increase in aircraft activity and aircraft noise levels.* ***The above will be done.***

Wilbur Smith Associates - Outline for Proposed Working Paper # 5	**Suggestions**
Summary of Evaluation Criteria:	
<u>Air Quality</u> Evaluation tool: ▪ MAG's Airport Emission Model ▪ Total operations in the region remain the same for all development alternatives, only under the new airport alternative will new forecasts be prepared to assign demand to the new airports and reduce operations at existing airports.	▪ *Some measure of sensitivity should also be applied under the maximized airport alternati**)*** E.g. a 4th runway at Sky Harbor would potentially impact demand for additional runway capacity elsewhere in the region. ***This is being done***
<u>Cost</u> Technology Alternative: ▪ Only costs for equipment to be included	▪ *Consider including administrative costs e.g. need for environmental analysis, public hearings etc* ***These costs are borne by the FAA ,and outside the scope of this study.*** These costs may be considerable relative to the equipment costs for each airport.

New Airport Development Alternative: ▪ Use cost data from new airports at Denver and Chicago.	▪ *Cost data for Denver Airport and new plans for a Chicago airport should not be used in a way that ignore factors that are unique to those projects.* ***It won't be used that way*** Regional differences, e.g. Denver replaced Denver Stapleton, no such scenario identified in the MAG RASP update.
<u>User Convenience</u>: ▪ Airport service areas will be defined as 30-minute drive times for each airport.	▪ *Evaluation user convenience and the service area for commercial service airports e.g. Sky Harbor needs to include public modes of transportation* ***This will be done.***. Accessibility demands are different for commercial service and GA airports
<u>Airspace Compatibility</u> ▪ No modeling	▪ *We would prefer that modeling be used* Would create a baseline for identifying problem areas where additional airspace analysis would be needed. ***It is through the large scale systems analysis that we will use to help define airspace problems that may need further analysis through modeling.***